

MAN!

"Man is the measure-
ment of everything."

If There Is Anything That Cannot Bear Free Thought--Let It Crack--WENDELL PHILLIPS

VOL. 7 — No. 12

Administration and Editorial Address:
P. O. Box 971, Los Angeles, Calif.

Los Angeles, Calif., December, 1939.

1 (537)

Single Copy 5 Cents

THE BALLOT ON TRIAL

The recent November state elections have given some very interesting results for the student of social conditions. In Ohio, voters defeated the Bigelow pension plan by a vote of 3 to 1. The plan would have granted an income of fifty dollars a month to citizens over sixty years of age and eighty dollars a month to couples. In California, the "Thirty Thursday" plan, granting thirty dollars a week to needy citizens over sixty years of age, was defeated by a vote of 2 to 1.

Since the present form of government in this country rests upon the supposedly irrevocable "right of the majority", the election results will be accepted and recorded as the wishes of the greater part of the voting citizens. This does not infer that the minority of the voters is satisfied to accept the results as a truthful and final expression of the voice of the people. It is true that no one is making the charge of having miscounted the votes. Yet, this election showed that subtle methods were used to circumvent the outcome of the election and that even more subtle wholesale methods are at the disposal of and available to the political bosses.

Predatory wealth has spent millions of dollars in order to defeat both pension plans. From the savior in the White House to the sanctum abode of Upton Sinclair, the enemies of the plans succeeded in lining up almost every supposed spokesman of the people to take a position against the measures. The radio, which is the forceful new blessing of the modern age, did its lion's share, with the aid of the paid press, in achieving victory for the reactionary forces of the land.

Thus it was that the sacredness and value of the ballot box, rather than the pension plan, turned out to be on trial. And what a miserable showing it was! Yes, there have always been and still are many ways available for buying an election.

The methods of intimidation used to defeat the two measures must not be passed up without a word. Not only were citizens ordered how to vote, but merchants, banks and all sorts of financial enterprises openly advertised, long before the election, that should the measures become laws, they would refuse to honor the warrants approved and voted upon by the majority of citizens in the country. In so doing, the ruling class gave ample proof as to whose interests the government and its laws are made to serve. In other words, the financial lords have once again made it clear that if a proposed law aims to protect the wealth which they have stolen from the people, well and good. They are for it and will see to it that it does become a law. If, however, a proposed law attempts to take some of the stolen wealth away from the financiers, the law can go to Hades. Who knows! Some day the people, the robbed masses, may learn to emulate the examples of those who rob their wealth—to the utter consternation and dismay of the thieves!

The pension measures, when examined closely, are far from being "revolutionary" measures, as the enemies wanted to have the people believe. The measures, patterned upon the theories of Silvio Gesell, simply meant to increase the purchasing power of a part of the people by issuing scripts which could be exchanged for merchandise or money. These scripts would have as little or as much value as the money which the government prints and circulates as a medium of exchange.

The cry that such a plan would have sent the country bankrupt is false. Does not the government itself pay pensions to tens of thousands of people? Do not the railroad companies do the same? In reality, both pension measures might have given the present order a new lease on life. It would have created an inflated prosperity. Neither of the two measures would have solved the plight of the millions below the age of sixty. With the onward march of the machine, one can see that the great army of unemployed, under the present profit system, will be ever increasing.

The solution to this problem does not lie in any kind of old age pension plan. It lies in the complete

(Continued on Column Three)



—Especially drawn for MAN! by Clifton Bennett.

ANOTHER "VICTORY"

Mr. Roosevelt has won the battle of the embargo. According to his emphatic desire, this country can now ship arms and war materials to any and all belligerents on a cash and carry basis. The daily press has hailed the "victory" as being worth an immediate billion dollar increase in American business.

When President Roosevelt delivered his message to Congress on Sept. 22, 1939, he urged the repeal of the existing embargo and stated:

"What is the advantage to us in sending all manner of articles across the ocean for final processing there, when we could provide employment to thousands by doing it here?"

In 1936, the same Mr. Roosevelt stated in a pre-election speech:

"If war should break out again on another continent, let us not blink to the fact that we should find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality . . . To resist the clamor of that breed . . . would require the unserving support of all Americans who love peace."

These two conflicting and opposite statements affirm the "sincere" motives behind Mr. Roosevelt's flowery and forceful oratorical outbursts.

The reaction of the sincere liberal element which believed so persistently in the sincerity of Mr. Roosevelt is most refreshing. It comes as a cruel though belated awakening. Perhaps, this disillusionment, on the part of the sincere liberals, in seeing the embargo on arms lifted, will serve as a concrete proof that no politician, once he assumes command, lives up to the bold promises he made. It is a proof that politicians, whether of one kind or another, conduct them-

discards and extinction of the capitalist system and the establishment of a new and completely different society based upon the sole motive and interest of the well-being of all.

The exploiters and financiers, instead of being jubilant over their victory in having the measures defeated, would do well to delve into the cause which has given birth to these manifold schemes of panacea, schemes which attempt to pump oxygen into their ebbing system.

And it is not difficult to find the cause: INSECURITY.

One third of this nation finds itself in this plight of insecurity. It has been in this critical condition since 1929. Ten or twelve million unemployed men and women indeed form a menacing army, rightfully seething with discontent and unrest. When such an army reads, even in the form of a summary, a work such as the erstwhile governmental "Structure of American Economy—Part One: Basic Characteristics", this vast army is bound to give birth to all sorts of schemes and ideas. And when their schemes are defeated in a manner as sinister as that employed in the last November elections, their unrest is not so easily appeased. The momentary victors would do well to have some of their paid professors read them a bit of history. They should read the page dealing with a certain queen—Marie Antoinette—who made history when she advised a starving populace to "eat cake, if they had no bread."

A mocked and fooled populace is a most dangerous thing. Yesterday they pleaded for only partial security, and predatory wealth handed them a plebiscite joker instead.

Tomorrow the same mocked and fooled people may no longer demand partial security or entrust their destinies to the well controlled ballot. Tomorrow they may rise to demand and take, not only bread, but cake as well. When that hour strikes, plutocracy and rulership, with all its evil, unjust, corrupt conditions which deprive the multitudes of the right of the pursuit of happiness, will vanish into oblivion. This is as certain as is the fact that the sun sets today and will rise tomorrow and the day after.

*—From this work one learns that 200 billions of dollars have been lost through the idleness of human and machine power since the depression. Every family in the land could have a \$6,000 home from this sum alone. Nine out of every ten consuming units in the country are in the \$2,600 a year or less bracket. The United States is dominated by 83 men, who rule finance and industry through inter-corporate investments and interlocking directorships.

selves in the same manner.

It certainly is not out of place to remind the disillusioned ones how the same Mr. Roosevelt persistently ignored and refused to heed the demands of millions of people who had literally begged him to lift the embargo on arms to the fighting population of Spain. In that persistent refusal, the president was obediently serving Capitalism and the Roman papacy.

Mr. Roosevelt, with the lifting of the embargo, may have succeeded in creating a momentary and artificial prosperity, a prosperity which will ultimately be drowned in the blood of the innocent victims who are falling on the battlefields of Europe. But we shall be made to pay for this prosperity sooner than we expect, to pay with that which is more valuable than gold—our own blood, our lives, our liberty.

The embargo repeal is a direct challenge to all those holding sincere, consistent and idealistic principles, a challenge which must be met by a direct refusal to participate in any industry or enterprise that may be used to aid and nourish the monster known as war, the demon through which capitalism aims to maintain and perpetuate its reign of plunder and exploitation, its very own existence.

Against the mercenary schemes and devices employed by capitalism and its governments, we hurl the anguishing cries of a perturbed and desperate humanity; we raise high the banner symbolizing the struggles and sacrifices made in behalf of the true principles of idealism, the idealism of a socially emancipated people—Freedom.

WHO BETRAYED WHOM ?

Samuel Polinow

The world received a tremendous shock when Hitler and Stalin signed a reciprocal agreement of mutual friendship on August 24th last. On that historic day, people of all shades and opinions plainly stopped for breath as a result of this puzzling unnatural affinity between Nazism (Hitlerism) and Communism (Stalinism).

At first glance the news was apt to be shocking, indeed, for an alliance between ideologies so opposite is a direct contradiction to the human sense of proportion. No one could have anticipated, a union between antagonisms as outspoken as the two ideologies represented since the day Hitler rose to power. (In fairness to Stalin it must be admitted that he has never been so outspoken in malice for his newly-wedded partner as was Hitler).

A few months have already elapsed since that eventful day. We can now relax somewhat from the terrific "shock" the Stalin-Hitler alliance left upon us and resort to some "realistic" thinking. Perhaps, in so doing, we might find a possible explanation for the political drama of the year.

The truth of the matter is that Stalin, in embracing Hitler as his political ally, acted in exact accordance with governmental policy. Those who placate him as a betrayer and intriguer simply throw into discard all basic purposes upon which governments rely for their national exigencies.

We need not go into forgotten history in order to illuminate upon the betrayals, plottings, check-matings and back-stabbing chicaneries which governments at all times practice in order to weaken a neighbor state for its own glory and preservation. For the moment it will suffice to record some of the betrayals and treacheries enacted by existing governments and still lingering within our memory. Let us begin with the World War of 1914:

If you recall, the first thing Kaiser Wilhelm did in the opening hostilities was to pronounce Germany's treaty with Belgium a "scrap of paper." He immediately sent his cannons roaring on the City of Liege.

Next in line came Italy. The Italian government had made a treaty with Germany, an alliance binding her to military assistance should Germany be involved in war. In a clever maneuvering by the Allies, whereby in a secret treaty of April 26, 1915, Italy

was offered a slice of Austria together with some islands, she readily agreed to forsake her German ally and took up arms on the side of the Allies. (It is not unlikely the same technique will be tried in this war, resulting in a like betrayal by Signor Mussolini . . .).

Again Italy played the role of betrayer when, right after joining the League of Nations, she closed her eyes to D'Annunzio's military venture in capturing Fiume. Later followed the treacherous invasion of Ethiopia, to which England vehemently protested but found her ally, France, politely adamant to England's demand for a joint action. England then retaliated by remaining passive during the civil war in Spain, while it was of strategic importance for France to aid the struggling loyalist republic. The raping of Albania may also be added to the category of betrayals when Italy broke an Italo-Albanian friendship treaty that was signed in 1927.

The cavalcade of treachery goes marching on: In 1928 Japan signed a treaty originated by Mr. Kellogg, then Secretary of United States, by which all great powers, Japan included, agreed to renounce war. A few years later Japan attacked and occupied Manchuko, with Britain then snubbing her co-signatory to the pact, the United States, by giving full sanction to the rapacious act. This favor is now being reciprocated by Japan in China, where British subjects are harassed by Japanese sentries, threatening even to entirely wipe out British interest in the Far East.

The rise of Hitler brought forth a series of diplomatic chicanery and political foul play as only could be seen among small town horse traders. First, we saw England's moral and material aid to Germany become a dominating factor in European power politics; next we saw France's alarm over Hitler's fortifying the Rhine, with England turning her back to her former War partner's demand for armed resistance against this menace at her border. England and France then proceeded to completely wreck the already disreputable League of Nations when it permitted Hitler's annexation of Austria. Then followed the Munich episode which, under the guise of "appeasement," made Czecho-Slovakia a victim of the betrayal of England and France. Russia, meanwhile, was completely left out of the picture by not even being invited to the conference table.

Poland's treachery, too, must not be overlooked. It is to be recalled that during the Czecho crisis, Poland had a 10-year treaty with the Hitler government and was turning her nose up to England and France, by whose gracious deeds she came into being. Just one year later the tables turned; Hitler, true to his usual form, forgot all about the amity existing between Poland and Germany and started preparations for an armed attack upon her territory, while Poland, sensing the imminent danger to her national sovereignty, ceased flirting with Nazidom and turned toward the Allies with a plea for a renewal of friendship with her former benefactors.

Meanwhile, political circumstances continued to wreak havoc among the "realistic" statesmen sitting in the diplomatic cabinets. The modern "Napoleon," growing too strong a menace by his policy of expansion, forced Chamberlain and Daladier to seek new allies and form new treaties to encircle the Hitler government and so prevent him from further aggression. As a result of this encircling policy, England and France sent commissions to the once-despised Soviet government, with instructions to sign a triple alliance between England, France and Russia. While the commissions from both sides were dickering and bargaining for a friendship pact, Hitler conducted secret parleys of his own with the former communist enemy, offering still better concessions—one, presumably, the division of Poland—which Stalin no doubt considered more favorable to his national state, and so betrayed one flock of betrayers for the other.

Who, then, betrayed whom? Can anyone with a sense of fairness point a finger at Stalin and say that he is the only black sheep in the family? Can any one who knows in heart and soul that the whole scheme of international politics is for one statesman to outplay the other accuse the Soviet government as the sole breaker of treaties?

Russia saw her winning chance in a treaty with Hitler and played the game with him. Hitler saw refuge in the tent of his former "scum" and played the game with Stalin.

But there is an argument: The Soviet Union has been acclaimed from the very day of its birth as a communist state, based on Marxian principles and proletarian ideology; a state whose triumph depended upon world revolution, not of territorial domination. Hence, Russia's entering into an alliance with the fascist blackguards of Hitler's Germany, her partnership division of Poland, her domination of the Baltic states, marked a complete departure from the principles and ideals upon which the "Revolution" had been founded.

Theoretically, the argument is true in every respect. As a "book" revolution the Soviet Union was expected to be just that. Only we must remember that when we are speaking of "realistic" Soviet Union we are dealing with an organized State, not with utopian principles. A state, particularly a totalitarian state—in its modern brutal form—is built upon a solid foundation of power and must, therefore, seek to maintain and strengthen that power at all costs. Its domestic policies must be that of oppression, its foreign policies that of expansion. To depart from these policies would be risking the collapse of its regime. Russia pursued that policy to the letter. She has been murdering and imprisoning her citizens suspected of rebellious tendencies within her own domain and has striven to extend her power to the farthest sections of her border—even as far as outer Mongolia.

It is true that in the early stages of the Revolution Lenin promised that the State would "wither away" after a complete proletarian victory. But that was only to lull away the revolution which was then still in its cradle. As the Soviet state progressed, Lenin himself drifted from the Marxian principles and set up a state of Cheka absolutism—an absolutism by far worse than that of Czarist days.

Stalin followed suit. He not only guided the political and economic destiny of the country on absolute authority, but even went much further: he gradually and very subtly prepared the Russian masses for a graceful departure from the principles of proletarian internationalism and educated them along the lines of "Russian" nationalism. This marked a new era in the Russian system of government as well as in the patriotically minded Russian population. Nationalism and imperialism, we should remember, go hand in hand. This partly explains why Stalin can pursue his imperialistic policies without a single protest being heard from a meeting in a Soviet factory . . .

The nationalistic tendencies introduced by Stalin into the Soviet system of government served also to reduce the margin between communist and fascist ideology, thus paving the way for closer cooperation between the two different social orders. We need only look back into the political activities of the Soviet government for the past decade to find that Bolshevism (the new model . . .) and Fascism are part and parcel of the same pattern. Tyranny has been rampant in all three totalitarian states. Political

(Continued on Page Eight)

REACTION IN CANADA

There are still people who believe that a so-called democratic government will wage a war against fascism. These people are the victims of shrewd politicians who cultivate and try to perpetuate a great and convenient illusion.

That both fascism and nazism have been nurtured and abetted by the "democratic" powers of both hemispheres is a fact known to even the cold curbstones. However, now that the conflict of interests has provoked a war between the "democratic" and the totalitarian states, the cunning politicians and the pious souls of democracy are trying to dish out to the people the stale and rancid balderdash of a democratic war against fascism. Meanwhile, the politicians, with the complicity of the pious and democratic souls, begin their holy crusade by instaurating fascism at home. This substantiates our contention that war, with its inevitable onslaught on civil rights, brings only fascism upon the workers of any country involved in it.

The black pall of reaction is bearing heavily upon the revolutionary and peace-loving elements of the "democratic" countries of Europe. The victims are already too numerous. But, in this note, we wish to speak particularly of our neighboring sister country, Canada. It seems that the over zealous liberal politicians of the Dominion are out to get first place in the infamous contest of instituting fascist methods and ways at home to make . . . the world safe for democracy.

The decrees of the Public Order enacted with the War Measures Act are all sweeping. In their all inclusiveness they empower the police force to wipe out every vestige of civil rights. And the police force is certainly using, misusing and abusing these extraordinary powers.

In British Columbia, the offices of Technocracy Inc. are raided and wrecked because of that organization's opposition to the sending of expeditionary forces to Europe. In Toronto, a young militant socialist, Frank Watson, is arrested and sentenced to a year in jail for an anti-war speech. However, the most spectacular feat came with the attempted wholesale frame up of some comrades.

In the early morning of Oct. 4th, the home of Arthur Bortolotti was raided by a number of Mounted Police and Toronto Red Squad. Bortolotti, Ruggero Benvenuti, Ernest Gava and Marco Joachim—the last three named boarding with the first—were aroused from their beds and taken into custody. The

house was then ransacked from attic to cellar and a large number of books and pamphlets confiscated. Two old broken revolvers, found in a box of old rusty tools, were also triumphantly confiscated. One of the men was released that same evening, but the others were held incommunicado for 24 hours. On Oct. 5th, they were taken into court and remanded for a week without bail. No charges were made at that time. However, on Oct. 12th, charges were laid under the special War Measures Act, and the men were accused of printing, circulating and distributing books, pamphlets, etc. which might cause disaffection for His Majesty's forces, etc. The stupidity and impudence of the frame-up can best be judged by the following facts: the men were charged with the "attempt to print, etc." on the evidence of a toy printing set 4"x5"; the books and pamphlets confiscated were neither for sale, nor for distribution, they were instead, the private library of the home. When the Crown was asked by the defense to substantiate the charges, the prosecution answered that to do so would entail too much work and time and that it was advisable to "deal swiftly" with these cases. After two weeks, bail was set at \$10,000 each for two of the men. It was denied to Bortolotti who had no citizenship papers.

After five weeks, during which the men had various hearings in court, all charges against them were dismissed when the attorney in the case, Mr. J. L. Cohen, brilliantly proved their inconsistency and reactionary bias.

Comrade Bortolotti, however, is still detained by Canadian Immigration Authorities who are trying to deport him to Italy on a specious technical pretext. Bortolotti has resided in Canada for 20 years. He has been active and outspoken in anti-fascist work. This fact clearly marks him for dangerous persecution if he will, finally, be delivered to the very same fascist Terror against which His Majesty's politicians claim to be waging a war of annihilation.

The Canadian capitalist press has entered into a conspiracy of silence about the infamous attempt to persecute and prosecute these workers and to, thereby, relegate all civil rights into the limbo of war time reaction. Canadian and American defenders of freedom must, therefore, not fail to take up an impressive agitation for the preservation of civil rights and for the quick and complete liberation of Arthur Bortolotti.

Walter BROOKS

VIGILANTES STILL RULE CALIFORNIA

Although we see that the liberal elements of California are priding themselves in the fact that in Governor Olson California has a man of integrity and courage, we are aware of the fact that the recent strike of cotton pickers in San Joaquin Valley has brought forward some incontrovertible proofs to upset these illusions.

We believe that the role of the liberal elements in America, as far as it affects the daily struggle of the workers, has never been put to so rigid a test as it was in this strike. No one is better fitted to describe what took place than is Attorney A. L. Wirin, of the American Civil Liberties Union, who was one of the leading participants in that strike. Says Mr. Wirin:

Vigilante terror, mob violence and threatened lynch law have returned to California. These recurrent contributions to the American scene by California Associated Farmers have gripped Madera County. They threaten to sweep throughout the San Joaquin cotton belt, and in their wake to destroy every basic civil liberty.

Last Friday afternoon the ranchers' representatives met with Madera County's law enforcement authorities. They announced a three-pointed program, and threatened unless carried out by 8:30 that evening, they would take the law into their own hands, "drive the agitators out, and clear the place up."

Their demands were:

1. That all strike leaders be jailed by 8 o'clock.
2. That all effective picketing be halted, by preventing the strikers from riding to any picket line on public highways in more than one automobile. Two or more automobiles, they argued, would constitute a "caravan" under the county's anti-caravan ordinance.
3. That all meetings of strikers in the public park be prohibited and stopped.

The authorities acceded to the first two demands: as to the third, they promised that an "emergency" ordinance would be adopted prohibiting all strikers' meetings in the park.

The program has been carried out to the letter.

Directly to Sacramento went Mr. Wirin. To Governor Olson he told the story of the death of civil liberties in the San Joaquin Valley. From Governor Olson came the renewed pledge that civil liberties would be maintained in all California—no matter what the cost.

—"The Open Forum", Oct. 23, 1939.

Last week when armed vigilantes threatened to "tar and cotton" me, forcibly remove me from Madera County and launched a reign of terror and violence against striking cotton pickers, invading their homes, assaulting and smashing peaceful picket lines, breaking up peaceful workers' meetings with violence, all fundamental civil liberties in Madera County were dead. They still are.

Last week I told the facts, without suggestion as to the reason for the breakdown of constitutional liberty in the San Joaquin, without criticism or condemnation of those in high places in California, upon whom must fall the responsibility for permitting these wholesale deprivations of civil rights in free America, in "liberal" California.

For over a week I have sealed my tongue, in daily, in momentary expectation that promises made to me, as counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union and attorney for the striking cotton pickers, would be kept. They have been broken. Now it must be told.

A week ago Sunday evening I held a conference with Governor Olson and Col. Charles Henderson, the Governor's special representative in the San Joaquin Valley, assigned by Governor Olson to uphold the Constitution and preserve the Bill of Rights.

In the interest of "peace and order," I agreed that I would recommend to the strikers that there would be no parade, caravan or processions until the constitutionality of Madera County's ordinance which prohibits such demonstrations, would be determined by Federal Judge Campbell Beaumont, before whom the test case was pending. I further agreed that if the ordinance were declared unconstitutional, there would be no such demonstrations. In turn, in the presence of the Governor, as the Governor's representative, Col. Henderson agreed that if an injunction were issued against the ordinance, such a court order would be fully enforced, and the right of the strikers to participate in caravans and processions would be completely protected. Judge Beaumont has not yet decided the case; the strikers have kept their part of the bargain; there have been no caravans, processions or parades by strikers in Madera County since that conference.

The morning after the conference with the Governor, instead of carrying out the Governor's orders, Col. Henderson, arriving in Madera County, left it immediately, withdrawing with him one-half of the strike highway patrol force dispatched to Madera to protect civil rights and maintain peace and order. Such incompetent, irresponsible and pledge-breaking conduct calls for exposure and denunciation. I have performed my duty in exposing it. Let all friends of labor and civil liberty denounce it. Let the liberal Governor of California, staunch believer in civil liberties, loyal friend of the humble, defenseless and exploited workers of California, know that such agents are not to be entrusted with upholding the Constitution and enforcing the Bill of Rights.

—"The Open Forum", Nov. 4, 1939

All is quiet in the San Joaquin Valley. During the last week there has been no terror, no violence, no bloodshed. Armed vigilantes have assaulted, beaten, or wounded no striking cotton-picker in the San Joaquin. No meetings have been broken up; no picket lines smashed; no lawyers threatened.

None of these have recurred because there has been no need for any of them. 24 hours of vigilante violence in Madera County succeeded in breaking the strike and in terrorizing the strikers so that they have not had the courage or desire to assert their civil liberties to meet and picket.

That there have been some, and in many instances, substantial economic gains, cannot be questioned. First, many ranchers, some openly, some secretly, are paying 90c and \$1.00 per hundred pounds for cotton picked instead of the 80c starvation scale offered by the Associated Farmers.

—"The Open Forum", Nov. 11, 1939.

We believe it is no exaggeration to assert that never has the futile attempt of the liberal elements which believe so strongly in "constitutional" rights as written on paper revealed itself to be so pitifully bankrupt as it does in this account rendered by a representative of these liberal forces.

Ordinarily, the liberal elements step into every attack upon labor after the blows have already been dealt. In this respect they are like the Red Cross. This time, however, as Mr. Wirin's account shows, the liberals stepped into the fight at the beginning. No doubt, the fact that Mr. Olson is governor was the driving force in the liberals' determination to prove that "constitutional" rights can be made to work, provided that the master pilot of the legal wheel wills it to be so. Not even for a single moment did they imagine that their "liberal governor" of California would let them down.

From Mr. Wirin's account we can conclude one of two things. Either Governor Olson could not find, in his whole administration, any officials who could carry out his order to preserve the "constitutional" rights of civil liberties, or the governor has shown himself to be insincere. If the first should be the case, why does not Governor Olson come forth with this as the reason for his failure to preserve civil liberties? Since he has not done so, we are inclined to conclude that it is the "great democratic governor" who has failed the liberal elements.

That it is the liberalism of Governor Olson which has fallen flat is brought out by a declaration made by Attorney Davis, at a public meeting on November 6, 1939, before the Central Labor Council of Los Angeles. Warren K. Billings, whose attorney Davis is, also spoke at this meeting. According to Mr. Davis, Governor Olson promised to have a pardon for Billings ready on his desk when the prisoner would be brought to him after his release approved by the Supreme Court of California and based on commutation of sentence. As we already know, Governor Olson has not kept his promise. Therefore, Billings and his attorney have appealed to organized labor to bring moral pressure to bear on Olson... "We... must

remember," said Davis, "that governor Olson is a politician."

We have stated these facts in the Billings case incidentally and in order to substantiate our premises.

What tops everything, however, is the opening statement of Mr. Wirin's account which appears in "The Open Forum" of November 18, 1939. Says Mr. Wirin:

"With the cotton strike called off, last week saw the gradual restoration of civil liberties in the San Joaquin Valley."

It was in the last issue of MAN! that we stated in our editorial "Constitutional Rights" a thought which can also be applied here as an answer to Mr. Wirin's statement of summary. We wrote:

"The real test for the inalienable rights of freedom of expression is offered in critical times. The fact that it may be enjoyed in non critical times proves nothing except that it is a shameful presumption in order to deceive people into the belief that that kind of freedom was worth having and should be defended."

Ours is a challenging statement which neither Mr. Wirin nor any other spokesman of the liberal elements which are bent on revering our "constitutional" liberties seem to be able to answer. In the event that any of them can and should, we open the pages of our journal to them.

We feel that the only lesson which the elements supposedly fighting for the maintenance of civil liberties should derive from this experience in the broken strike of the cotton pickers is this: The workers are much better off if let alone to fight their own battles. If they lose, at least they have the satisfaction of knowing that they fought back to the best of their abilities. Interference on the part of liberals in the midst of the struggle is a hindrance.

Paradoxically enough, Mr. Wirin has helped in making the strike an abortive one while he had hoped to bring to it so much moral support.

No one can truly help the workers in their daily struggles for economic betterment or for bigger social changes. It is the workers who must help themselves.

Whenever workers conduct their fights along lines laid down by politicians or liberals, they are doomed to the same sort of cruel awakening that has been the experience of the cotton pickers in the San Joaquin Valley of California.

The State, Its Laws and the Social Order

John P. Simoneau

We must examine history to see how man has acted and why he acted just as he did. A great force behind man's actions has been an economic one. As we go through the years we find that it has always been the case that the greater part of the people have toiled in poverty while a few, the "elect", have as the old saying goes, "never soiled their hands with toil" and have "lived off the fat of the land." Thus, in ancient days it was slaves, plebeians, and patrians. In feudal days it was serfs and nobles, and in our day it is the working class and the capitalist class. In each case the great majority worked hard and lived in poverty in order that the few might have all the good things of life. Why did they do this? There are two reasons:

1.) The multitude of the people were kept (and still are) in too much ignorance to hold what they produced.

2.) The privileged few have always had that powerful weapon, the State, to hold down the people and to wrest from them the best of what they produced.

In feudal days the State was headed by a king. The nobility and the church gave their support to the king and his government, for it was this State that enabled them to retain their privileged position. The king decreed Laws, and these laws were used to hold the serfs in their miserable slave condition. These laws were numerous, and severe penalties, usually death, were inflicted upon transgressors. A serf had to remain all his life on the piece of land he was born upon; he had to work more than half the time for his master, the noble, without pay; he had to surrender his daughters or his choice cattle to his lord if the lord so desired; he was forbidden to keep weapons of any kind; he had no right of redress against the nobility (a noble could not be called to court for an offense against a serf); he had to pay a tithe amounting to 1-10 of his produce to the church, these and countless other laws held the serfs in abject slavery to the nobility. In no case do we see any Law which protected the multitude of the people, the serfs. All laws were carefully designed to keep them down in dark ignorance, superstition, and slavery. Thus we see that the State used its Laws to hold the serfs down. In spite of the State and its Laws, the serfs did occasionally revolt. The peasants of Germany staged a fierce revolt in the sixteenth century, and were drowned in their own blood by the soldiers of the nobility. Martin Luther, founder of Protestantism, said of these peasants: "They

must be put in their place." And he approved of the bloody measures by which this revolt was crushed and the peasants put back into serfdom again. This is one of the many proofs that religion is in existence only to hold down the many for to benefit the few. The Catholic Church always upheld the feudal system in which the serfs were slaves.

The Church with its religious opium came to be used as an instrument that the privileged few employ over and over again in order to keep the workers down, to keep them blindfolded. Science shows us where the earth came from, how life developed, how man evolved, how civilization developed; science also shows us the processes of life (Botany, Zoology); it shows us the chemical processes of life, and nowhere does it show us any force which is not concerned with the basic units of matter, molecules and atoms. Thus religion stands exposed by science as an hoax and fraud.

Now let us look at the modern State. Right away we see that it is made up of three things: bureaucrats (office holders), police, and an army. We see that it has many Laws, which the bureaucrats, police, and army enforce (by force). Anyone can see that modern society is just as feudal society was: a rich owning class, the capitalists (in feudal days the nobility), and a working class (in feudal days the serfs). Now we shall see the purpose of the Law. Science has enabled mankind to produce an abundance of the necessary things of life. But mankind as a whole, the multitude of the people, are prevented from obtaining this abundance by the State and its Laws. The workers in the factories must surrender the greater part of what they produce to the capitalists (the serfs surrendered their produce to the nobility), keeping only a small amount in the form of wages. When the workers wake up and strike for higher wages to get more of what they produce, the State, acting according to its Laws, at once sends its police and its army to break the strike, thus holding the workers down just like the king, his Laws, and his army were used by the nobility to hold the serfs down. Why do the workers not take over the factories for themselves, so that they can keep what they produce? Because the State and its Laws prevent them from doing this. The State by its Laws decrees that the workers must, as the serfs did, give away to the few (the capitalists) most of what they produce. The poor have no property, or at most an insignificant amount of it, so the Laws to

(Continued on Page Four)

IN RETROSPECT OF CURRENT EVENTS

Government -- In Whose Interest?

As an aftermath of the General Strike on WPA projects that took place several months ago, the Department of Justice had a federal jury at Minneapolis indict 140 workers on the premise that it is unlawful to strike against projects conducted by the government. The first group of these indicted workers has already been found guilty and has been sentenced to imprisonment. A second group is now being tried. No doubt similar prison sentences will be meted out to it.

In Omaha, Nebraska, the agents of the same Department of Justice recently jailed eight leaders of the Teamsters' Union. Some legal excuse will be found to railroad them, too.

Only last month the head of the Department of Justice, Mr. Frank Murphy, stated in an address made at an emergency gathering for the preservation of civil liberties:

"An emergency does not abrogate or dissolve the Bill of Rights. . . . To the many friends of civil liberty gathered at this Conference, I want to give the emphatic assurance that in this emergency, as well as in time of peace, the Department of Justice embraces that policy without reservation. . . ."

To the ears of the gathered liberals who wholeheartedly applauded Mr. Murphy these were high sounding words.

But what do the same liberals have to say about the manner in which the agencies under Mr. Murphy's Department are putting his high sounding words into practice? In the face of these damnable convictions, will the liberals be as ready to denounce Mr. Murphy as they were to applauding him?

Pathetic, indeed, is the comment made by the "New Republic" (Nov. 8, 1939) on the Minneapolis convictions: "Three days in jail and a \$5.00 fine would be ample." But, dear liberal friends of the "New Republic" of what are the convinced workers guilty that they should be punished in the manner you prescribe and seem to favor? Why, in the very same editorial you state that "... the individuals found guilty appear to be not leaders in any sense but rank and file WPA workers indignant because their wages were cut in a heartless fashion. . . ." Are these reasons for punishment?

From "The Call" of Nov. 18, 1939, we learn that Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, of the Department of Justice fame, is "... cooperating with the National Protective League which offers a bounty of \$25 (or more) for information leading to the arrest—not necessarily conviction—of 'suspected foreign agents'. The reward for the alert snooper, according to the League's plan, which is modelled along the lines of the war time American Protective League, is payable whether the suspect is convicted or not. In the event of conviction, however, the bounty is upped to \$500."

The Department of Justice's activities both in "peace" times and in times of "emergency"—an emergency artificially created in the attempt to drag us into war—point to only one conclusion: the Department is an agency of government and as such, despite Mr. Murphy's assurances, like any other branch of the government, is an enemy of civil liberties and an instrument of suppression faithfully serving its master—Capitalism. The institution of government itself makes the utterances of any of its members about the preservation of liberties a meaningless prattle.

The liberals who believe that some good can be accomplished through an institution based on principles of rulership and violence and existing for the defense and preservation of privilege are still mistaken. The anarchist position that government is an evil is still correct.

Blind Justice

All of us recall the case of Grover Bergdoll, of brewer-millions fame, who became a "fugitive" of the law because he had escaped the draft during the last world war. During the last few months the case has again come to the fore with Bergdoll's decision to end his self imposed exile in unsafe Germany. He was brought to trial before a military court, was found guilty and was sentenced to prison.

During the trial, Bergdoll admitted that he had come into this country in 1929 and had spent four years in his Philadelphia home—unmolested by the agents of the law. He again came to this country in 1935 for a period of three years. Again the law did not disturb him.

From this we can safely conclude that Bergdoll will have an easy time of it in serving the sentence that was given him as a "fugitive from justice."

The case of Richard Gallogly, another scion of wealth, is also an example of the blindfolding of justice. Gallogly was serving a life sentence for murder in Georgia. A United Press dispatch of October 11, 1939, states in part: "He (Gallogly) spent the last year in a private Atlanta hospital at his family expense, under a guard employed by his family, and found conditions in the State prison such that he was able to woo and win Miss Vera Hunt, music teacher

at the State College. . . . Gallogly, in jail here, (Dallas, Texas), said he escaped from Georgia authorities last week for no other reason than to come to Texas, surrender and fight extradition. . . . Gallogly will allege that his health is too delicate for him to complete his sentence."

Believing, as we do, that every type of punishment inflicted upon man by man is a disgrace to the human intelligence, we do not condemn or begrudge either Mr. Gallogly, in his escapade, or Mr. Bergdoll, as a draftdodger.

Rather, we are prompted to conclude that hundreds of thousands of men, women and children who fill our degrading penal institutions will be able to derive very little in the way of comfort and solace from the manner in which a Bergdoll and a Gallogly have been able to turn justice in their favor on their wheels of wealth. The majority of the common people who find themselves behind prison bars know very little about the class struggle and all it implies. Least of all do they realize where the real blame lies for their having ever been brought about to break the laws or to be punished. Examples such as those furnished by Bergdoll and Gallogly may tend to open their eyes as to the meaning of class struggle.

The more fortunate victims of the present system, those who have never seen the inside of a prison, may likewise come to understand the maneuverings of a blind justice. They will see how a privileged few who possess the wealth of the multitude can get away with punishment meted out to them by the laws of the land, laws by which the poor and rich alike are supposed to be ruled.

Scoundrels versus Idealist

Slander is a weapon often employed by scoundrels in order to besmear the name of sincere idealists. Scoundrels know only too well that a lie, when repeated often enough, will begin to stick.

The recent bombing of the Hitler shrine saloon in Munich revived the lie often stated in connection with Marinus Van der Lubbe. And it is the Communist Party, the party to which Van der Lubbe at one time belonged, which is responsible, more than any other person or group, for the circulation of this lie. That is why every unscrupulous journalist is now referring to the Munich bombing as another engineered job, "like the Van der Lubbe Reichstag fire."

The unscrupulous Communist press did not even wait for the Munich incident in order to repeat their defamation against Van der Lubbe, a one time party member.

In attempting to defend the Hitler-Stalin union and at the same time fight off the governmental onslaughts carried on against their party in France and in this country, Mr. Mike Gold writes in The San Francisco "People's World", issue of October 11, 1939:

"Do you remember the Reichstag fire? It was the famous frame-up by Hitler, in which he doped and beat a poor outcast, Van der Lubbe, into swearing that the Communists had hired him to set fire to the German Congress. . . . It served as Hitler's legal excuse for making mass raids on the Communists."

These words of Mike Gold are an example of the most vicious and malicious type of slander that can ever be employed.

All that one has to do in order to prove to himself that Gold has indulged in intentional distortions is to examine the files of daily newspapers (except those of the Communist Party) from September, 1933 to January, 1934.

Let us quote a few passages from some of the journalists of the day; Mr. W. E. Brockman, correspondent for the Associated Press, wrote from Leipzig on December 23, 1933:

"Van der Lubbe did not appear to take any notice of the verdict. . . . Hated by the communists and despised by Nazis, no one except his official counsel and his mother in far away Leyden (Holland) had a good word for him. . . . But if Van der Lubbe received no favors he asked none. Throughout the trial, Van der Lubbe insisted he set the fire alone and unaided."

In a cable dated January 10, 1934, and coming from Leipzig, Germany, Mr. John A. Bauman, also of the Associated Press, states:

"Marinus van der Lubbe, 24-year-old Dutch stoneman, was beheaded today for firing the German Reichstag building in Berlin last February. He had repeatedly confessed setting the fire, but steadfastly refused to divulge any information as to whether he had any accomplices. . . . Throughout the long trial Van der Lubbe stolidly insisted that he set the fire which damaged the Reichstag building last February, alone and unaided. He scoffed at efforts to implicate his four codefendants, all acquitted by the supreme court on Dec. 23."

From these quotations the reader can see that Mike Gold has indulged in more than malicious slander. He is an outright liar of the most despicable type. In order to further understand the dishonest motives of Mr. Gold and his band of cohorts, one should read a documented letter of Sylvia Pankhurst. Miss Pankhurst is a well known English Communist; her letter appeared in the "New Leader" (London, England) on September 29, 1933. One must bear in mind that Miss Pankhurst was a member of

the International Inquiry Committee of the Reichstag fire. This Committee met in London. The letter reads:

"That it (the Reichstag fire) was a plot of the Nazis I always doubted. . . . That the Nazis took advantage of the fire does not, however, compel the conclusion that they were its originators. . . . We cannot ignore the personality of Van der Lubbe, the self-confessed incendiary. The motives he alleges for his deed are, whether we agree with them or not, a logical result of his opinions, of which there is abundant testimony from those who have worked with him. He is an anti-Parliamentary Revolutionary. From his known opinions and the statements he has made, one must deduce that he fired the Reichstag as a protest against a subservient Parliament which permitted the Nazi-Nationalist combination to take power, not by the votes of the electorate, but by the menace of their private armies. Van der Lubbe's protest was also directed against the policies of Socialist and Communist Parties which, after promising Social Revolution, did not, for one reason or another, offer effective resistance to the Nazis. . . . I consider it my duty to state my belief that the man on trial for his life is no provocative agent, no tool of the Nazis, but has acted from his convictions."

Miss Pankhurst thus offers a full explanation of the Reichstag fire and gives the true facts about the role played by Van der Lubbe. More than that, she reveals the true motives for the contemptible falsifications and perversions of the truth on the part of people of Mr. Gold's calibre.

We must mention another point, one not brought out by Miss Pankhurst but one which is, nevertheless, significant. While Van der Lubbe refused to implicate the four Communists accused with him, the co-accused Communists had the ruthless boldness to demand of the Nazi regime to behead Van der Lubbe. Well, their request was complied with, and they were subsequently freed. Thus, the close relationship between the Hitler and Stalin regimes dates back to 1933, at least.

The spokesmen and writers for the Communist Party have since then been conducting a long series of defamation against Van der Lubbe. In so doing, they have succeeded, perhaps unaware to themselves, in bringing about their own moral assassination as spokesmen for a party which cannot be associated with anything that is clean, sincere, truthful and idealistic.

The State

(Continued from Page Three)

protect property are to protect the wealthy, and to keep the workers poor by denying them free access to the means of production. Thus the workers are held in bondage, always poor, always forced to give away to their rulers what they produce, and always forced to support their oppressor, the State, by paying taxes. Paying taxes is, to the working class, the equivalent of buying a whip and paying a man to lay it onto their backs.

The State, which is the tool of the ruling few, would be thrown into the utmost confusion were the workers to refuse to pay taxes. Worse confusion in the State would result were the workers to refuse to turn over to that parasite class, the capitalists, the cream of what they produce. Still worse confusion and dismay would come to the State were the workers to refuse to obey the Law, thereby throwing off the straight jacket which now binds them in wage slavery. So the working class now, as in feudal days, can gain its freedom only BY ABOLISHING THE STATE AND ALL LAWS.

Just as peaches do not grow on poison ivy vines, so the customs, traditions, and institutions which are sponsored and upheld by the State and its Laws are as bad as the State. They are, of necessity, moulded in a pattern designed to accomplish the one great aim of the State—to hold the workers down in poverty, superstition, ignorance, and wage slavery. Thus, to secure freedom we must not only abolish the State and all Laws but we must also scrap all customs, traditions, and institutions of present day society.

It is evident that the code of morals now upheld by the State and Religion are designed as are the State and Religion, to hold the workers in subjection to the capitalists. Therefore, we must do away with the code of morals which now rules the world, and in its place put into effect a code of morals which will bring mankind true Justice, Freedom and the Brotherhood of Man.

MAN!

A monthly Journal of the Anarchist Ideal and Movement

MARCUS GRAHAM, Editor

Subscription Price: \$1.00 per year, Six months Fifty Cents.—Sample Copies Free Upon Request

MAN! invites the collaboration of all writers and artists who are in sympathy with our ideas to send us essays, poems and drawings. No payment can be made. Where return of manuscript is desired sufficient postage should be included.

Administration and Editorial Address:

MAN!

P. O. Box 971 Los Angeles, Calif., U.S.A.

GREAT ANARCHS

Have not all great composers been anarchists—from Bach to Strauss? At first blush the hard-plodding Johann Sebastian of the *Well-Tempered Clavichord* seems a doubtful figure to drape with the black flag of revolt. He grew a forest of children, he worked early and late, and he played the organ in church on Sundays; but he was a musical revolutionist nevertheless. His music proves it. And he quarreled with his surroundings like any good social democrat. He even went out for a drink during a prosy sermon, and came near being discharged for returning late. If Lombroso were cognizant of this suspicious fact, he might build a terrifying structure of theories, with all sorts of inferential subcellars. However, it is Bach's music that still remains revolutionary. Mozart and Gluck depended too much on aristocratic patronage to play the role of Solitaires. But many tales are related of their refusal to lick the boots of the rich, to curve the spine of the suppliant. Both were by nature gentlemen, and both occasionally arose to the situation and snubbed their patrons outrageously. Handel! A fighter, a born revolutionist, a hater of rulers. John Runciman—himself an anarchistic critic—calls Handel the most magnificent man that ever lived. He was certainly the most virile among musicians.

I recall the story of Beethoven refusing to uncover in the presence of royalty, though his companion, Goethe, doffed his hat. Theoretically I admire Beethoven's independence, yet there is no denying that the great poet was the politer of the two and doubtless a pleasanter man to consort with. The mythic William Tell and his contempt for Gessler's hat were translated into action by the composer.

Handel, despite the fact he could not boast Beethoven's peasant ancestry, had a contempt for rank and its entailed snobberies, that was remarkable. And his music is like a blow from a muscular fist. Haydn needs not be considered. He was henpecked, and for the same reason as was Socrates. The Croatian composer's wife told some strange stories of that merry little blade, her chamber-music husband. As I do not class Mendelssohn among the great composers, he need not be discussed. His music was Bach watered for general consumption. Schubert was an anarchist all his short life. He is said to have loved an Esterhazy girl, and being snubbed he turned sour-souled. He drank "far more than was good for him", and he placed on paper the loveliest melodies the world has ever heard. Beethoven was the supreme anarchist of art, and put into daily practice the radicalism of his music.

Because of its opportunities for soul expansion, music has ever attracted the strong free sons of earth. The most profound truths, the most blasphemous things, the most terrible ideas, may be incorporated within the walls of a symphony, and the police be none the wiser. Suppose that some Russian professional supervisor of artistic anarchy really knew what arrant doctrines Tschaiakowsky preached! It is its freedom from the meddlesome hand of the censor that makes of music a playground for great brave souls. Richard Wagner in Siegfried, and under the long nose of royalty, preaches anarchy, puts into tone, words, gestures, lath, plaster, paint, and canvass an allegory of humanity liberated from the convention of authority, from what Bernard Shaw would call the Old Man of the Mountain, the Government.

I need only adduce the names of Schumann, another revolutionist like Chopin in the psychic sphere; Liszt bitten by the socialistic theories of Saint-Simon, a rank hater of conventions of art, though in life a silken courtier; Brahms, a social democrat and free-thinker; and Tschaiakowsky, who buried more bombs in his work than ever Chopin with his cannon among roses or Bakunin with his terrible prose of a nihilist. Years ago I read and doubted Mr. Ashton-Ellis' interesting "1849", with its fallacious denial of Wagner's revolutionary behavior. Wagner may not have shouldered a musket during the Dresden uprising, but he was, with Makhail Bakunin, its prime inspirer. His very ringing of the church bells during the row is a symbol of his attitude. And then he ran away luckily enough for the world of music, while his companions, Roedel and Bakunin, were captured and imprisoned.

Wagner might be called the Joseph Proudhon of composers—his music is anarchy itself, coldly deliberate like the sad and logical music we find in the great Frenchman's *Philosophy of Misery* (a subtitle, by the way).

And what a huge regiment of painters, poets, sculptors, prosateurs, journalists, and musicians might not be included under the roof of the House Beautiful! Verhaeren of Belgium, whose powerful bass hurls imprecations at the present order; Georges Eckhoud; Maurice Maeterlinck; Constantin Meunier, whose eloquent bronzes are a protest against the misery of the proletarians, Octave Mirbeau, Richepin, William Blake, William Morris, Swinburne, Maurice Barres, the late Stephane Mallarme, Walt Whitman, Ibsen, Strindberg, Felicien Rops, the sinister author of love and death; Edward Munch, whose men and women with staring eyes and fuliginous faces seem to discern across the frame of his pictures



LUDWIG van BEETHOVEN (1770 - 1827)

(From a Plaque of Jules Scarceux)

febrile visions of terror, and the great Scandinavian sculptors, Vigeland and Sinding; and Zola, Odilon Redon, Huysmans, Heine, Baudelaire, Poe, Richard Strauss, Shaw,—is not the art of these men, and many more left unnamed, direct personal expression of anarchic revolt?

James Huneker

Nor is there cause for alarm in the word of anarchy, which means in its ideal state unfettered self-government. If we all were self-governed, governments, would be sinecures. Anarchy often expresses itself in rebellion against conventional art forms—the only kind of anarchy that interests me. A most signal example is Henry James. Surprising it is to find this fastidious artist classed among the anarchists of art, is it not? He is one, as surely as was Turgenieff, the de Goncourts, or Flaubert.

I have left Berlioz and Strauss for the last. The former all his life long was a flaming individualist. His books, his utterances, his conduct, prove it. Hector of the Flaming Locks, fiery speech, and crimson scores, would have made a picturesque figure on the barricades waving a red flag or casting bombs. His *Fantastic Symphony* is full of the tonal commandments of anarchic revolt.

Strauss, who is a psychological realist in symphonic art, withal a master symbolist; back of his surface eccentricities there is a foundational energy, an epic largeness of utterance, a versatility of manner, that rank him as the unique anarchist of music. He taps the tocsin of revolt, and his velvet sonorities do not disguise either their meagre skein of spirituality or the veiled ferocities of his aristocratic insurgency. Sufficient to add that as in politics he is a social democrat, so in his vast and memorial art he is the anarchist of anarchists. Not as big a fellow in theme-making as Beethoven, he far transcends Beethoven in harmonic originality. His very scheme of harmonization is the sign of a soul insurgent.

(From the "Revolutionary Almanac," edited by Hypolyte Havel)

TWO DOUBTING PACIFISTS

Bertrand Russell, who served time in London for opposition to the First World War, and who, if correctly quoted in the October 29th issue of the Los Angeles "Times" in an article "Pacifist No. 1 Reverses His Field" by Andy Hamilton, now feels that Hitler is a greater menace than was the Kaiser in 1917 and is therefore supporting this war. He is described, as co-author of "Principia Mathematica" "the most tremendous achievement of the human mind". As in the Bible parable those gifted with the most talents are held accountable for using them. With respect to Russell for his courage in the past in behalf of freedom and of his criticism of the Bolshevik tyranny it would seem that his great intellect would be more in line with the love of logic and truth which he emphasizes if it were balanced with a belief either in pacifism or militarism as a method. Those who have not dared to stray from the party line cannot be expected to look further ahead than the next election. Russell, with his varied experience and his broad viewpoint as expressed years ago in his "Proposed Roads to Freedom", and as late as Feb. 11, 1939 in the "Nation" under the title of "Munich Rather Than War" has given an answer to his own doubts:

"(Hitler) He is the result of our victory in a war to defend democracy and destroy militarism. If we win another such war, Hitler will be succeeded by someone as much worse than he is, worse than the Kaiser. To suppose that we shall have learned anything from our previous mistakes is totally unbelievable. . . . War can still settle problems but it can only settle them the wrong way. . . . The rise of Hitler, for a time, shook my pacifism, as it shook that of many others. . . . The one thing that seems quite beyond question is that the next great war, if the forces are at all evenly balanced, will destroy civilized life throughout Europe, leaving no possibility of any government except a military tyranny."

Russell is quoted in the "Times": "Neither a slave nor a rebel, however, is wanted in a democracy." The total result of the war which he now supports will make slaves or rebels to the resulting tyranny—not of a United States of the World—but of isolated national tyrants who will defer any kind of brotherhood, even the mythical brotherhood of a super League of Nations, for centuries.

Half way positions are always dangerous, and although no one denies that it also takes courage to maneuver around when assailed by the right and left, it would seem that a man of Russell's intellect ought to see far enough ahead to know that the pacifism, freedom, growth of the mind of the child, and the participation of the individual in community life, which he feels is necessary in a world that is worthwhile cannot develop in a world where militarism and tyranny reigns. Russell wishes the above fruits of anarchism but wishes to keep the well controlled policeman's club—the United States of the World—hoping that it will not develop into the militaristic monster of Hitler or Stalin or in the deceitful diplomacy of Chamberlain. His recent pro-war stand is the natural result of a mind divided—accepting adherence both to freedom and to that greatest denial of freedom—the State.

C. E. M. Joad, head of the Department of Phi-

losophy and Psychology in the University of London, former member of the Ministry of Labor, and well-known Socialist; pacifist author of "Why War?", published early in 1939, has just announced in the November "Atlantic Monthly" that:

"In a government department I shall do my best to assist in the efficient conduct of the war."

How did Joad get that way? Although as a philosopher and a pacifist he might have been expected to have heard that one of the greatest opponents of despotism, as one of the greatest pacifists—Leo Tolstoy—considered courts, prisons, government, and churches which supported government, all based on force equally with the more apparent forceful units of the army and navy, as a Socialist he could not be expected to do other than follow the party line and uphold British imperialism, as all but seven of the Socialists in parliament did, when the crisis came.

Joad gives the answer as to the cause of his support of the war in his book "Why War?":

"But though I think men are wicked as well as stupid, it has been my contention throughout this book that war is the result of man's stupidity rather than of his wickedness; it is born of thick heads rather than of hard hearts. . . . People want peace, yet they get war. Why do they get war? Because, while desiring peace, they nevertheless desire things which are incompatible with peace; because while wishing to avoid war, they pursue policies which entail the risk of war among their consequences."

In his article in the "Atlantic Monthly" Joad shows plainly that he has either succumbed to old age or to that disease which attacked and killed Ramsey MacDonald: the bourgeois mind. The substance of his article referred to above and entitled "The Duty of a Pacifist" is that as one becomes older one becomes a part of the community and does not want to be isolated from the common work of the community.

Both Russell and Joad are not to be counted as militarists, but as Doubting Pacifists. They are honest men, intellectuals who have had time to think, but who have not been able to see that they were never pacifists in the first place. By taking part in government, by electing judges and executives and legislators they were duty-bound to obey the decision of these men. In supporting war they are therefore logical. There could not be war if there was no government to make war. A pacifist who supports government must therefore support the result of government: war. Being sincere men they do not express condemnation of the C. O. In fact Joad makes it clear in his article that:

"I should regard the man who is prepared as a C. O. to war to suffer for his faith as the equivalent in the moral sphere of the genius in the aesthetic and the mystic in the religious as being, that is to say, one of those endowed with special insight who are sent into the world to give conscious expression to life's instinctive purpose, and to point the way to a new level of evolutionary development. Because they believe, they will in time be believed."

Losing sight of the ultimate good he chooses what he considers to be the lesser of two evils: that of passively supporting government civil service in

(Continued on Page Six)

SCIENCE CONDEMNS RACISM

The Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York recently issued a report entitled **Conquest by Immigration**. This report was prepared by Dr. Harry H. Laughlin of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. Dr. Laughlin's thesis is that every nation has a specific racial stock, that such stocks bear permanent mental, moral, and social traits as their biological endowment, and hence that genetic or biological considerations should govern the policy of our government with respect to immigrants and the foreign born.

Similar attacks are spreading in our country against minority groups of one kind or another. No less than seventy measures to limit the civil rights of aliens are now before Congress; numerous provocative pamphlets against large groups of American citizens—Negroes, Jews, Catholics—are being circulated in the mails. These movements are often "documented" by spurious racial teachings, set forth as the accredited conclusions of biology, anthropology, and social psychology.

When the sponsorship of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York is given to a restatement of such false racial doctrines, men of science must answer. The reply to the Chamber published in this brochure was prepared by a committee of experts set up for that purpose by the New York section of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom. The committee consisted of Professors Franz Boas, Donald Lancefield, and William M. Malisoff, and Dr. Nelson P. Mead.

The letter was then sent for study to nine other American scientists, sociologists, and historians, who have given it their unqualified endorsement: Professors L. J. Stadler, George H. Shull, L. C. Dunn, Th. Dobzhansky, John M. Cooper, Gordon W. Allport, Robert M. Maciver, and A. M. Schlesinger, and Dr. Charles A. Beard.

* * *

THE REPLY

It was with amazement that we read the report of the Special Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York—and the attendant publicity—proclaiming the very same racial myths which are causing so much hatred and brutality in the world today.

Mr. Harry H. Laughlin of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, who wrote this report, asserts that immigration into the United States should be cut down to the vanishing point in the interest of "race integrity" and "race improvement."

The underlying principles on which the report is based are that:

1. Every nationality—English, French, Irish, Italian, Spanish, etc., is a "race."
2. Every "race" has its inherent unalterable physical, mental, and moral qualities.
3. Some of these "races" are superior and others inferior, and progress in human society and culture is primarily due to the biological endowment of "racial purity."
4. The successful development of a nation requires it to "establish racial standards, to hold the country against all would-be invaders, whether they come as enemies in battle or as friendly immigrants."
5. The immigrant policy of the United States should be governed by biological or "racial" considerations because "progress cannot be built on mongrel melting pots."

6. The cost of public institutions for the mentally ill and for other public charges is largely due to the immigration of "racially inferior stock."

The entire argument follows the theory of innate racial qualities. Serious psychologists, anthropologists, and sociologists have emphasized over and over again that it is absurd to speak of any nation as a biological unit or "race," and that no proof has ever been given to show that the mental, cultural, or moral characteristics of a so-called race can be deduced from its descent. Last December the American Anthropological Association—certainly more competent than the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York to pass judgment on such matters—unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Be it resolved that the American Anthropological Association repudiates racialism and adheres to the following statement of facts:

"1. Race involves the inheritance of similar physical variations by large groups of mankind, but its psychological and cultural connotations, if they exist, have not been ascertained by science . . .

"2. Anthropology provides no scientific basis for discrimination against any people on the ground of racial inferiority, religious affiliation, or linguistic heritage."

Mr. Laughlin merely asserts that "the immigrant must furnish the blood—that is, the inherent qualities and capacities which will respond favorably to our environment" (p. 39). He does not offer one shred of evidence to prove that such "inherent qualities and capacities" exist. Nor does he attempt to justify himself in assigning "superior" and "inferior status" to the various races he enumerates. We feel justified in the suspicion that there is an ulterior motive in this indiscriminate and unscientific use of the term "race." The term does service as an invective. It is a mere appeal to ignorant prejudice. Surely Mr. Laughlin knows that the modern populations of all parts of Europe as well as of America are the products of unceasing mixtures of peoples, and that the highest types of civilization of their respective times have belonged to such widely different peoples as those of Greece, Rome, France, Spain, Holland, England, Italy and Germany—wherever historical conditions favored cultural development.

There have been two major waves of immigration into the United States. The first from 1609 to about 1890 brought immigrants chiefly from northern and western Europe—the second since 1890, chiefly from southern and eastern Europe. The first group came to a country that was still primarily agricultural, offering opportunity for advancement to the pioneer, the farmer, the entrepreneur. With the disappearance of free land, the spread of industrial production, and the rise of the large corporation, fewer opportunities were available to the immigrants of the second wave. Most of those who came after 1890 became industrial laborers in the factories owned by those who had entered the country in the earlier stages. This applies to those coming from northern and western Europe as well.

To Mr. Laughlin, these developments in American history have no meaning. He pretends to believe that the difference between the two groups of immigrants is strictly biological. He believes that the northern and western European is innately a "pioneer land-settler type" and that the southern and eastern European is the "industrial laborer type." This contention was refuted in 1927 by Niles Carpenter, **Immigrants and Their Children**, Census Monograph No. VII, published by the Bureau of the Census of the United States Department of Commerce. Using the census figures of 1920, Carpenter showed (on page 293) that the immigrants who came from northern and western Europe after 1890 did not prefer to take up agriculture.

"The Irish, and the English, Scotch and Welsh," he writes, "are engaged in farming to a very limited extent indeed, and even Germans seem to be so employed to a smaller degree than the Bohemians and Moravians, who are a central European, that is, a 'new immigrant' people. Neither do the 'new' immigrants engage chiefly in rough, unskilled labor, as is often stated. The Hebrews emphatically do not, and the Bohemians and Moravians are mostly farmers. On the other hand, a considerable number of Irish, who are 'old' immigrants par excellence, are so employed, while an even greater proportion of English, Scotch and Welsh seem to be coal mine operatives; that is, they are engaged in work that is heavy and laborious and not so skilled but that the 'unskilled' Polish, Italian and Slovak peasants may also perform it."

The statistics used by Mr. Laughlin are entirely misleading. The last 107 pages (almost half) of the report are devoted to figures on the number of native and foreign born inmates of state and federal hospitals for the mentally ill and of state and federal penal institutions. The casual reader would naturally assume that this mass of figures substantiates the recommendations made in the report; but on examination it is found that the data, far from support-

ing Mr. Laughlin, actually support the opposite of the view he holds.

In order to use statistics to answer the question: Is there a high criminal rate among the foreign born in the United States? we must first determine the percentage of foreign born in the country. Then we must compare this percentage with the percentage of foreign born in the prisons. This would be the only scientifically valid procedure. Mr. Laughlin did not adopt this procedure, however. He limited himself to an enumeration of the number of foreign born and native inmates of some state prisons and hospitals. Such an enumeration is meaningless. Furthermore, the age distribution of foreign born and natives is different, and since the rates of criminality and hospitalization change with age, this element must be taken into consideration.

The following example is typical of Mr. Laughlin's use of statistics. He lists 946 foreign born inmates in seven New York state prisons out of a total of 6,382 prisoners, that is 14.8%. This may seem like a high percentage, and that is obviously the impression intended. But New York State's foreign born population is 25.9% of the total population (1930 census). In other words, 25.9% of the population was responsible for 14.8% of the crimes (in the cases and for the period to which Mr. Laughlin's figures apply), while 74.1% (the native born) was responsible for 85.2% of these crimes.

It should also be noted that many official reports are available on just this point. In 1934, the precise period with which Mr. Laughlin is dealing, there was submitted a report of the Legislative Commission on Jails in Connecticut. The statistics in that report are much more complete than Mr. Laughlin's, and the conclusion drawn is that "crime is not primarily the product of the foreign born, but it is chiefly American made, the product of American conditions and American citizens" (p. 72, author's emphasis).

Similarly, a statistical study of mental defects in New York State by Dr. Benjamin Malzberg of the New York State Department of Mental Hygiene led the author to conclude (*American Journal of Psychiatry*, 1936, p. 137): "Comparing rates of first admission among native and foreign born whites, we find that, after due consideration of age and environmental differences, the latter exceed the former by only 8%. In several of the more important groups of psychoses there are no significant differences between the rates of the two groups. It is highly probable that if proper corrections could be made for other environmental differences, such as economic and occupational status, the remaining discrepancies in rates of first admissions would be either eliminated, or reduced to a degree easily reconcilable with a theory of environmental differentials."

We view with alarm the rapid spread in our own country of the hysterical cry that the alien or the Jew or the Catholic, or some other scapegoat, is responsible for all the ills of society. The report of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York seeks to lend scientific support to such demagoguery. We would not be true citizens of a democracy if we did not enter our vigorous protest against any such abuse of science. The scientist has an ethical obligation to avoid conclusions that are not warranted by the evidence. What can we say of the ethics of Mr. Laughlin when he makes a report which so patently violates all the rules of scientific method and procedure, or of the Chamber of Commerce when it publishes such a report without ascertaining whether Mr. Laughlin's views are supported by reputable scientists?

Science teaches—and we reaffirm—that an individual should be judged by his own qualities and not by assigning him to a group because he happens to have a certain head form, a certain form and color of hair, skin and eyes, or a certain form of nose. There are differences among individuals, of course. We are not justified, however, in assuming that there are inequalities among the different nationalities (Mr. Laughlin chooses to call them "races") or that one people is born superior to another. Most of the observable differences between peoples of different nations are merely different folkways, the product of accumulated traditions in their past social history. These are readily transformed by environment, as has been abundantly demonstrated in the great mixture of peoples derived from all nations who have become ideal American citizens when they have lived in the social atmosphere of America for an adequate period of time to become adjusted.

—American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom.

DICTATORSHIPS

"The dictatorships . . . make war. We make war. They build vast armaments. We build vast armaments. They use poison gas. We use poison gas. They say, all restrictions off on the most brutal instincts of mankind. We say the same, until once more, fighting evil with evil until we are the evil we fight, far from conquering our enemies we let them make us after their own image . . . How can Satan cast out Satan?"

—Henry Emerson FOSDICK in "Fellowship"

Two Doubting Pacifists

(Continued from Page Five)

time of war rather than helping the war in an active manner or opposing it likewise. "Survival" is the word which he uses to express the most important virtue in a pacifist in time of war. No wonder military men call pacifists cowards if the ideal is survival. Underneath the respectability of the bourgeois mind he is honest enough to doubt his decision, for near the end of his article he states:

"Not very heroic all this, you will say. I know that it is not. A man ought to have the courage of his logic, you will add . . . a poor sort of zealot this, you will conclude, who thinks that war is never justified and always wrong, yet is prepared to take government work when war comes. But I am not a zealot. I am, I hope, a reasonable common sensible sort of man."

The tragedy of Russell and Joad is that of the intellectual whose vision is bounded by material laws, by secure and profitable positions in which their power of authority keeps them from appreciating the faith and vision, the poverty and simplicity, the courage and character shown by such men as Jesus, St. Francis, Thoreau, Tolstoy and Gandhi. These men did not choose the lesser of two evils. It they had done so we would never have heard of them. They chose the ultimate good.

All great men do not need to state the Truth in the same words nor do they necessarily need to be anarchists to be appreciated by anarchists. According to the Light which men have should they be expected to act. Both Russell and Joad have seen this Light and have chosen to turn away from it. There is yet time for them, and for others, to think this matter of peace and freedom through: to follow faith and emotion as well as reason and logic, and to see that a pacifist who supports the State is but half a pacifist.

Ammon A. HENNACY

Drama

("The Male Animal", a comedy by James Thurber and Elliot Nugent. Presented during the week of October 23, 1939, at the Mayan Theatre, Los Angeles, Calif., by the American Theatre Foundation.)

Notwithstanding the misleading title and classification of this play, the excellent central theme deals with the Sacco and Vanzetti case. This is not the first time that the life and death of our two comrades have been treated dramatically on the American stage. The case, as a whole, was presented by Maxwell Anderson in "Gods of Lightning." The case of Dante, Sacco's son, was dramatized by the same author in his play "Winterset." "The Male Animal" uses one of Vanzetti's famous letters as the central idea around which the whole play revolves.

Superficially, "The Male Animal" seems to be concerned with a triangle involving a Professor Thomas Twitchell, who is rudely awakened to a realization that he is not the victorious suitor of the town belle in spite of the fact that he is married to her. He learns that she still loves the athlete Joe Ferguson whom she spitefully did not marry. When the authors deal with the triangle sub-theme of the play, they deliver some stinging blows to that most sacred of humanly conceived citadels of hypocrisy and deceit—the institution called marriage. Despite this commendable quality, the triangle issue ends in a manner as hollow as that of the ordinary movie "epics" censored by Hays. The professor who denounced the institution of marriage so eloquently is nevertheless possessed of the same "animal instinct" concept as are those who believe in marriage. To the credit of the authors, it should be pointed out that Professor Twitchell reveals his common "animal" concept while he is under the influence of liquor and is, therefore, irresponsible.

So much for the love theme of this play. Taken by itself, it would certainly not make the play worthy of a place in the pages of literature. At times it may appear that the authors are wasting too many words on the love triangle. In reality, they are doing this in order to bring the real plot of the play into the realm of natural surroundings. And it is the real plot which soon enough becomes the life and soul of the play.

Professor Twitchell, like most of his brethren in the learned profession, knows more than he dares teach or utter in his classroom. In his soul lie dormant his sympathies for and with those struggling militant forces of mankind which fight and die in order to bring about a just society. On the college campus, Michael Barnes issues a radical publication, which throws the trustees, who run the college, into fits of anger and consternation. And one day word gets around that Professor Twitchell is going to read to his class in literature a famous letter of Bartolomeo Vanzetti. At first the trustees are bewildered. Quickly regaining their composure, they leave no stone unturned in order to prevent so great a calamity from taking place. Professor Twitchell never suspected that the mere announcement of the reading of a letter written by a man now dead could ever cause so great a commotion. Confronted by the discovery of his wife's love for the athlete on one hand and the line-up of almost everyone (including his wife who confesses worrying more about "security" than principles) on the other hand, the non too rebellious professor, on the verge of utter despair, is struck by a sudden determination to carry on the battle which has become a challenge to everything he ever came to hold as dear as this issue. Even to the point of destroying his whole life, Prof. Twitchell meets the challenge hurled before him by the whole caboodle of the hypocritical citizens. It is at



this point that the play reaches its height of dramatic importance in the ringing declaration made by the professor:

Prof. TWITCHELL: "I didn't start out to lead a crusade. I simply mentioned one day that I meant to read to my class three letters by men whose profession was not literature, but who had something sincere to say: Lincoln, General Sherman and Vanzetti. I chose Vanzetti to show that broken English can sometimes be very eloquent."

ED. KELLER: (a politician and trustee): "I wouldn't object if this was just a case of broken English. It's more than that: Vanzetti was an anarchist. He was executed for murder. It's a dangerous thing to bring up."

Prof. TWITCHELL: "No, it's a dangerous thing to keep down. I am fighting for a teacher's right. But if you want to make it political, Ed, I'll meet you on that ground. You can't suppress ideas because you don't like them. You can't forbid me to mention the name of a dead man whom millions of people believed innocent. This is a university. It is our business to bring light into this muddled world—to follow truth. . . . If I can't read this letter today, tomorrow most of us will not be able to teach anything except what Ed here and the legislature permit us to teach. Can't you see what that leads to—what it has led to in other places? We're holding the last fortress of free thought, and if we surrender to prejudice and dictatorship we are cowards."

ED.: "Well, we've taken a stand. I wouldn't care if that letter was the sermon of the Mount."

JOE FERGUSON: "Why can't you read Hoover? He writes a lot of stuff."

Prof. TWITCHELL: "Hoover can't write as well as Vanzetti. . . . He (Vanzetti) wrote that after

I Am War

I was conceived in passion, hatred, envy and greed, born in the morning of antiquity, and have a genealogy whose every page drips with red blood of innocence. I respect neither the feebleness of gray hairs, the helplessness of infancy, nor the sacredness of virtue. I ride ruthlessly and impartially over the form of the weakling or the form of the giant.

I paint the midnight skies a lurid glow from the burning homes I have ravaged, and I turn peaceful scenes of rural beauty into a raging hell. I set neighbor against neighbor in deadly combat, and I incite the brother to slay his brother.

I make puppets of kings, princes of paupers, courtiers of courtesans, and thieves of respected subjects, and empires melt before my breath as does the mist before the morning sunlight.

I make of religion fanaticism; and of all men I make playthings devoid of reason and justice. Through intrigue I make the intelligent powerful, the unscrupulous wax fat on the spoils of blood-won victories gained by others, and the less learned suffer for their own ignorance.

Famine, want and misery follow in my path; I lay waste green fields and still the hand of industry. I pillage the land of its resources, but contribute nothing of benefit to mankind. I lay a heavy tribute upon my most loyal subjects for the maintenance of my establishment; I squander the vitality and lives of those who serve me faithfully, yet return to the world nothing but ruin and ashes. The baubles of fame I confer on some are but empty shells of false standards wherein the license to commit murder and rapine is held to be the insignia of glory by a mistaken civilization.

I can offer no excuse for my having come into existence, nor can I give one plausible reason why I should not cease to be, other than that so long as men who wield influence are permitted to gratify their selfish desires and ambitions at the expense of the many who must carry the burdens and endure the suffering, that long will I continue to exact my toll of sorrow, devastation and death. For I am pitiless—devoid of all feeling; I fear neither man nor God; I am amenable to no law, and I am in myself the law and the last resort.

I AM WAR!

—James Logan MOSLEY

he was sentenced to die, in April 1927. It has been printed in many newspapers. It appears now in this book. You could destroy every printed copy of it, but it would not die out of the language, because a great many people know it by heart. (begins to read the letter) 'If it had not been for these things, I might have lived out my life talking at street corners to scornful men. I might have died, unmarked, unknown, a failure. Never in our full life could we hope to do so much work for tolerance, for justice, for man's understanding of man, as now by accident. Our words—our live—our pain nothing! The taking of our lives—the lives of a good shoemaker, and of a fish peddler—all. That last moment belongs to us—that agony is our triumph.'

Thus the central theme of the play is stated. The above excerpt is the axis around which the entire action of the play revolves.

At times the words of Prof. Twitchell may sound somewhat hollow. An example of this is his suggested inferences that our colleges of learning are the last fortresses in the land where truth holds forth. If this is so, it is no discredit to the authors. This play, like all true literature, is a dream of literary minds as to what should be rather than what is. The play serves as an inspiring call to the teachers of our institutions of learning to dare to stand up courageously for the truth always. As such, "The Male Animal" becomes a monumental play. In its printed form it certainly is destined to outlive its scheduled stage presentations in New York and other parts of the country.

Mr. James Thurber, one of the authors of the play, has for many years been an editor of the fashionable magazine "The New Yorker". His wit and satire have been put to good use in this penetrating and absorbing play. This play, in my estimation, has been erroneously classified as a comedy. In reality, it is a tragi-comedy on our poor mortals.

"You can't suppress ideas," say the two authors through "The Male Animal."

"Never in all our life could we hope to do so much work for tolerance, for justice, for man's understanding of man. . . . That last moment belongs to us—that agony is our triumph." What inspiring words that ought to serve us so well, especially nowadays when a darkened mankind finds itself being ravaged by slaughter, exploitation, injustice and ruler-ship!

No! A thousand times—No! Our martyred comrades have not died in vain. Neither at Charlestown nor Chicago, Japan nor Spain, Italy nor in any part of the world.

Our momentary difficulties and sufferings, in the immortal words of Vanzetti, are "our triumph."

The splendid play of Thurber and Nugent is ample proof of this. "The Male Animal" is more than a clarion call to battle in behalf of truth and justice. It is a reaffirmation of our confidence and a prophesy of the destined ultimate triumph of Anarchy, the ideal for which we work and live, the basic foundation of genuine freedom. Finally, the triumph of Freedom will not be personal—it will be the universal triumph of an emancipated Mankind.

Marcus GRAHAM

NOTE: I am indeed grateful to the men in charge of the typewritten manuscript used for stage purposes for allowing me to use the excerpts quoted in this review.

M. G.

No Law Against Dying

If by some remotely conceivable coincidence you should happen to dislike the good-looking can't take the under-handed object to the right of way we overdo things. . . .

If you've got a special ultra-super imagination that can't stand a little high-class hypocrisy now and then and maybe you'd like your live and die made just a little more to order like the schoolbooks always said. . . .

Well. . . then, brother, take the inside track to heaven with no stops along the trip. . . .

I know a tall handsome bridge where you can fill out your coupon for the perfect rich uninterrupted future. . . .

Because as long as I'm running this show you'll have to keep your nose clear and your yap shut like a clam and settle down until I need a dummy for our war-games. . . .

Far as I know there's no law against crossing the great divide if you don't know your place or can't work for what we want to give you and besides we haven't got room enough for all you outlaws.

Take off mister and do a good job or won't you look prosperous deflated in a riverbed with that overworked brain of yours drying on the sand. . . .

And when you take the chromium sleeper to fairyland and company just try and tell the big-shots how to run things over yonder and see if you don't land on a diet of fresh air. . . .

We'll be there before long for some easy money and we'll sure straighten you out when we do. . . .

Your goddam lucky to die this cheap some people are awfully expensive to nut away. . . .

William PETERSON

Books and Pamphlets Received

DEL NATURAL by Laboremus. 38-page pamphlet. Analectos, San Jose 938, Montevideo, Uruguay.

IBERIA EN LA ESTACADA, del Germina Alba. 130 pages, pamphlet form. Publicaciones Analectos, Montevideo, Uruguay.

LOS PRECURSORES, del Varios, 126 pages, pamphlet form. Same publishers as previously listed book.

DOCUMENTOS HISTORICOS DE ESPAÑA. Juan Pereyra, Olavario 738, Buenos Aires, Argentine. 76 pages. 50 Cts.

EMMA GOLDMAN, 70 HOLDS FAST TO ANARCHY 8-page-leaflet. Los Angeles Libertarian Committee, 540 No. Harvard Blvd., Los Angeles, Calif.

RUBAIYAT OF TODAY with Introductory Preface by Walter E. Holloway. 47 pages, pamphlet form. Authors Publishing Committee, 1038 S. Alvarado Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

SANGRE DE "TRIBUS" by P. Bernard. 46-page pamphlet. El Sembrador, Buenos Aires, Argentine. (\$0.20).

THE BILL OF RIGHTS: The Story of Civil Liberty—1938-1939. 80 page pamphlet. American Civil Liberties Union, 31 Union Square, New York City.

THE SECRET INTERNATIONAL: Armament Firms at Work. 48 pages, pamphlet form. 6d. Union of Democratic Control, 34 Victoria Street, London, S. W. 1, London England.

UNPLEASANT WORDS

During the last month we have been able to read and analyze the jubilee issue of the *Freie Arbeiter Stimme*, the weekly publication of the Jewish Anarchist Federation. This 40 page issue was released in October, in view of the fortieth anniversary of the journal. The contents of the issue in question have prompted us to say a few words, unpleasant to say the least, in connection with the publication and the celebration held for the anniversary.

We note that among the speakers at the gathering held in New York City were Mr. I. Baskin, Secretary of the Jewish Socialist Workmen's Circle, and Mr. I. Feinberg, a vice-president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. In Los Angeles and Cleveland, the gatherings were greeted by the respective local managers of "Forward", the Jewish Socialist daily newspaper.

We do not find it necessary to say anything more on the gatherings held for this fortieth anniversary celebration. We feel that the names we have mentioned speak for themselves and qualify very well the anarchist atmosphere of the gatherings. Suffice it to say that we recall Mr. Feinberg as having posed in a political campaign in Los Angeles with the recently ousted Republican Mayor Shaw, whom Feinberg qualified as "friend of organized labor."

In reading the jubilee issue, we were struck by the fact that almost twenty of the forty pages are taken up by paid greetings in the form of advertisements, chiefly from trade unions. Among the signers of these greetings are: Sidney Hillman, David Dubinsky, Julius Hochman and M. J. Lynch. There are also greetings from various branches of the Workmen's Circle and from members of several groups embodied in the Jewish Anarchist Federation.

The really disheartening part of the whole thing, however, is revealed in the literary and spiritual contents of the issue.

The main editorial on the first page refers to the *Freie Arbeiter Stimme* as the "weekly organ of the Jewish Anarchist Federation." With this exception, not once is the word anarchism mentioned or the philosophy of anarchism even hinted throughout the editorial. Rather, its ending, which defines the spirit of its entirety, reads as follows:

"Long live the shining ideals of the Jewish Socialist people of Labor! Let the free voice of the Jewish progressive folksman be heard at all times!"

Going further with our reading, we find articles dealing with "Pioneers of Libertarian Socialism in America," "The Lesson Which Poland Has To Teach," "Forty Years," "What To Be Proud About," "Wherein Lies Our Strength," "Superficial Comments," "A Few Theses About Soviet Russia," "To Be Or Not To Be," "Free Socialist Ideas in Jewish America," "About A Jewish Academy," "Forty Years Social Work In America," "The F. A. S. and the Jewish Theatre" and "The Free Tribune." Many literary essays, poems and stories complete the spiritual contents of the jubilee issue of the *Freie Arbeiter Stimme*.

We note distinctly that not a single article in the whole issue is devoted to or deals with the propounding or explanation of the philosophy of anarchism. And we have every reason to believe that this omission was no mere co-incidence. In an editorial appearing three issues after the one we are discussing, we read the following words:

"The Voice of Anti-State Socialism", which we are publishing in this issue, was written for our jubilee issue. Due to technical difficulties, we regretfully had to delay its publication."

The "explanation" does not suffice for us. It fails to explain. We have, however, read the article in question. And we find that its contents reveal quite fully why it was withheld from the jubilee issue. Had the article appeared in the anniversary issue, it would have been the only article dealing with and upholding the philosophy and teachings of anarchism. At the same time, the article, which we expect to publish in our next issue, gave an intellectual analysis of the utter bankruptcy of all authoritarian social and political schools of thought.

We are forced to ask this question: Was not the withholding of an article analytically and intelligently dealing with the anarchist philosophy a move to avoid offending the socialist and labor politicians whose greetings adorned the jubilee issue of the weekly organ of the Jewish Anarchist Federation?

Let us go on with an analysis of the jubilee issue. In an article entitled "Anarchist Unorthodoxies," T. L. Miles writes as follows:

"If it is possible and necessary, in a period of revolution, to unite with others and participate in a government, why, then, should it not be permissible to do so even now?... Many anarchists have of late begun to call themselves Libertarian-Socialists... Do they think that changing the name will help? If anarchism has earned a bad name for itself, the 'nail' is not in the word anarchism but in its ideas as the anarchist propagates and practices them... We must adopt a new declaration of principles and adopt other and more appropriate methods."

Perhaps the writer of this very unanarchistic thought was guided by the recently issued Manifesto on Libertarian Socialism or by the fact that our comrades in Spain did carry on compromises with the government, compromises which, however sincerely made, brought only disastrous results to our own comrades and to the revolution itself. In all events, we feel that the best reply that can be given on this question is the clear, correct, concise and complete exposition offered by our esteemed collaborator Melchior Seele on the question of the Manifesto on Libertarian Socialism. (MAN!, April and June, 1939).

Joseph Cohen, former editor of the *Freie Arbeiter Stimme* has also contributed an article to the jubilee issue. It is entitled "Light of Eternity" and reads, in part:

"Our hatred towards reaction and government reign is not a blind one, one which should teach us that because we are opponents of government, therefore all governments are evil: the constitutional as well as the despotic, the democratic as well as the dictatorial. To thus interpret and understand anarchism is pure senselessness... To support the more or less democratic governments in their struggle against the representatives of dictatorship, tyranny and bestiality is, also, not a crime against anarchism... To preach opposition to war now, or even to remain indifferent to it implies strengthening of the hands of Hitlerism-Stalinism."

If these words, written by one who for many years was editor of the *Freie Arbeiter Stimme*, are the words of an anarchist, we are willing to renounce any and all claim to being anarchists. Each and every quotation we have given is, in our estimation, a reflection on the whole interpretation of the anarchist philosophy on the part of the Jewish anarchist movement in this country. It is a chaotic movement, to say the least. We must not fail to mention that there are exceptions, as there are in every movement. But, for the most part, these exceptions have preferred to remain outside of the Jewish Anarchist Federation and have tried to acquire for themselves a clear understanding of the anarchist philosophy.

In "The 41st Year," an article written by the present editor of the *Freie Arbeiter Stimme*, we read "Really correct are those 'pious' anarchists who have often upbraided the F. A. S. because it is not consistent, not consequent enough and does not stand strongly by the precepts of the anarchist 'bible.' And how can one, at all times, be concerned with purity and precepts when one stands with both feet on the ground and is busy cleaning, clarifying and analyzing oneself?"

These words of the present editor only tend to show further the chaotic condition in which the Jewish anarchist movement in this country finds itself. Naturally, we are referring here to a Jewish anarchist movement with the idea of embracing those who think of the *Freie Arbeiter Stimme* as the voice of the movement and insofar as the paper itself speaks for the movement.

It is interesting to note what Emma Goldman has to say in the jubilee issue. In her article "More Strength, More Belief," we read:

"True, in your youthful years you not only assumed a critical position towards us, but you also condemned the activities of our comrade Alexander Berkman and of myself... It seems to me that it has never been so necessary as it is to day to bring to the people whom we can reach the logic and righteousness of the anarchist ideas and tactics... I wish to believe that with your 41st year you will start a new beginning but, with your 40 years of experience, knowledge and, let us hope, wisdom. Again you will then appear in your real colors and ideals—a thoroughly anarchist voice that will be inspired by the trenchant anarchistic thought—brave, courageous and daring... I wish you more strength, a deeper belief, a keener ardor in the struggle that lies ahead of us. Only upon this road will you confirm that you have grown up to the responsibility you took up forty years ago."

The words of Emma Goldman explain most adequately what is wrong with the F. A. S. Sad to say, the contents of the jubilee issue show that her words have had no effect.

Our readers may wonder why we have gone to such lengths in quoting from and analyzing one issue of a non-English publication. We feel we have had to do this in spite of the fact that the task was unpleasant and disheartening. The F. A. S. claims to be the freest existing tribune in the Jewish language. This is only partly true. It has been a free tribune for almost everyone except those elements within the Jewish anarchist movement which have, from time to time, challenged its consistency and sincerity.

The F. A. S. claims to be the organ of an anarchist movement, and it strives to be known as such among the anarchist movements throughout the world. We, in our modest way, have always tried to expound the anarchist principles and philosophy which, to us, offer the most just, courageous, logical and happy solution to the woes of humanity. We do not adhere to any "bible." Rather, our respect, love and claim for the anarchist philosophy are based on the writings recorded by our teachers and on the ardent struggles for which so many of our comrades have fought and died. In view of this, we feel that we are justified in saying that the *Freie Arbeiter Stimme*, in spite of its claim to the contrary, has forfeited any and all moral right to consider itself and be considered as an anarchist journal. No publication which allows things such as we have quoted to be printed in its pages has the right to qualify itself with the word anarchist which, in its very essence, is the negation of what the passages we have quoted show.

As a final word, we wish to state that it is up to the sincere Jewish speaking element of the anarchist movement in this country to do something to ameliorate this condition and to vindicate itself before the anarchist movement of the world.

In this connection, we wish to mention the publication which our Jewish comrades of Argentina have been publishing clandestinely for several years. It is called "Unser Wort" (Our Word) and is indeed a publication worthy of mention. In spite of the fact that we disagree with it in its attitude toward the Spanish situation, its integrity and consistency cannot be questioned. It commands our respect and admiration.

MAN!

ANARCHISM

"What matters it whether it be a sabre, an aspergill, or an umbrella that governs you? It is always a stick, and I am astonished that men of progress should dispute about the choice of a cudgel to tickle their shoulders, when it would be much more progressive and less expensive to break it and throw the pieces to all the devils."

Theophile GAUTIER

(Contributed by the Book-Friendship Circle)

Financial Statement

From Groups: Affair Circolo Aurora of Mass. \$50.00; Affair Gruppe I Refrattari of Mich. 28.80; Gruppo Libertario of N. J. \$15.00; On list through Emilio \$5.00; Radical Library \$2.00. Newspaper sales: Los Angeles 72c.

From Individuals: John Holland \$3.00; Ann Pierce (England); Claude Lyttle \$2.00; F. Heckin, A. Mautner, Jules Scarcerieux, H. F. van Der Meer, John Rossetti, L. Di Lano, R. B. Garcia, \$1.00; J. P. Simoneau 50c; Dorothy Fay 25c.

Total Income	\$115.57
Expenditures	105.82
Balance on Hand	83.39
Error in addition (more)	1.50
Total Balance on Hand	\$96.64

Who Betrayed Whom?

(Continued from Page Two)

cal antagonists have been ruthlessly destroyed in almost the same manner. Oppression, regimentation, and the curbing of every vestige of freedom have been consistently prosecuted by all three dictators.

Moreover, the foreign policy of Stalin has always been more favorable toward Hitler and Mussolini than to the Allied states. This is one reason more why Stalin embraced the Fascist bloc. Not only have commercial relations been highly maintained with the two fascist countries, but also politically Stalin aimed for closer cooperation with Hitler and Mussolini. General Krivitzky has proven this very conclusively; the facts he revealed about Stalin's conciliatory aims toward Hitler's Germany stand today unrefuted.

However, we must not accept Stalin's pact with Hitler as a "final" bond between Bolshevism and Nazism. At this critical war atmosphere, it perhaps was good diplomacy for such a treaty of friendship. Tomorrow the atmosphere may change—and then we may see a new betrayal... That really is the gist of what was intended in this discussion. Mainly, the purpose was to show that Russia today is an absolute STATE, and as such betrayed no one in particular by signing a pact with Nazi Germany. As previously pointed out, all states pursue this policy of betrayal and Russia acted in no way different from them.

If the Soviet Union did betray any one, it is the principles and ideals of liberation for which the whole working class as well as the freedom loving people of the world has hoped in the new social order promised by the October Revolution... It is these hopes that have been shattered by Russia's latest union with fascism.

I am the sum total of all that has ever been.
I am the repository of all that is to be.
I am Hope Eternal.
I am the custodian of Destiny.
On my feet only Life go forward.
On my shuttle of Imagination I can weave a world of beauty and by my Creative Power I can make that world real.
My one demand is freedom to grow—the common weed asks no less.
I AM THE CHILD.

JUST TRY TO REMEMBER!

The occasion of the ANNUAL

DAYBREAK COSTUME DANCE

Friday Night, Dec. 15, 1939

WEBSTER MANOR — 119 E. Eleventh St.

Given by the

MODERN SCHOOL OF STELTON, N. J.